

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
AT KNOXVILLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)	
)	
v.)	No. 3:06-CR-94
)	
ULYSSES ROBINSON)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This criminal case is before the court on the defendant's objections to the magistrate judge's report and recommendation [doc. 37], to which the government has filed a brief response, relying on the record and its previous filings [doc. 38]. The defendant asks the court to review the magistrate judge's decision and states:

Comes the Defendant and files this Objection to the Magistrate's Decision as it relates to the defendant's Motions to Suppress, rendered March 9, 2007, and asks that the District Judge reverse the Magistrate's decision and grant the defendant's Motions to Suppress the search warrant and the warrantless arrest and subsequent search of the defendant.

Under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), a *de novo* review by the district court of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation is both statutorily and constitutionally required. See *United States v. Shami*, 754 F.2d 670, 672 (6th Cir. 1985). However, it is necessary only to review "those portions of the report or

specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b); *see also United States v. Campbell*, 261 F.3d 628, 631-32 (6th Cir. 2001).

The court has reviewed *de novo* the report and recommendation [doc. 35], the pleadings, the transcript of the suppression hearing [doc. 30], and the exhibits. In the absence of any specific objection, the court **ADOPTS** the conclusions of the magistrate judge, and it is hereby **ORDERED** that the defendant's objections are **OVERRULED**. It is further **ORDERED** that the defendant's motions to suppress evidence [docs. 15 and 18] are **DENIED**.

ENTER:

s/ Leon Jordan
United States District Judge